



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## ROUSIERS'S THEORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE LABORER.

M. ROUSIERS is one of the writers who are seeking to determine the indirect effects of the modern industrial development upon the situation of today and therefore upon the outlook for tomorrow. The volume which he offered to economic readers sometime ago<sup>1</sup> is an extremely suggestive contribution to the discussion along this line. It is an attempt to determine the influence of industrial development upon the laborer considered as a producer. As a consumer, as a purchaser of commodities, the condition of the laborer has undoubtedly been improved by the introduction of cheaper methods of production and the consequent fall in the price of many of the comforts and necessities of life. But it is not with this aspect of the question that M. Rousiers is concerned. His attention is turned to the laborer as a seller of labor-power, as a bargainer for a share in the common product with the capitalist and the entrepreneur.

To the investigation of this aspect of the question, the method adopted by M. Rousiers seems especially adapted. He has applied to the study of social evolution a principle already well known in the natural sciences. As in physical evolution, progress has not been uniform along all lines of development, so that at any one time there are in existence types of many different evolutional stages ; so in economic progress, the various industries have not passed through successive stages of development simultaneously, so that at any one time there are in existence industries typical of many periods of industrial growth. As in physical evolution, the age of fishes has been succeeded by the age of amphibians, the age of amphibians by the age of

<sup>1</sup> *The Labour Question in Britain.* By PAUL DE ROUSIERS, with a Preface by HENRI DE TOURVILLE. Translated by F. L. D. HERBERTSON. London: Macmillan & Co., 1896.

mammals, and yet fish and amphibians have neither all been exterminated, nor all been evolved into a higher type, but many continue to live on in a higher age representatives of a lower stage of development; so in economic evolution, the age of hand-made goods has been succeeded by the age of machinery, and yet by the side of the highly developed textile industries the belated sewing trade lives on, the representative of a lower industrial régime.

The student desirous of determining the influence of economic progress has two methods of investigation open to him. He may study some representative productive process, the textile for example, in its whole course of development. He may note changes in the condition of the laborer as a domestic industry is evolved into a machine industry, as the spinner of the eighteenth century is transformed into the factory hand of the nineteenth. Or he may confine his attention to a single cross-section of economic history, and select, and compare with one another, simultaneously existing types of successive stages of industrial development. He may, for example, compare with the machine hand in the cotton factory the worker in the belated sewing trade. For the investigation which M. Rousiers has attempted the latter method, as compared with the former, has two distinct advantages: First, in comparing the condition of laborers existing at the same time and in the same country the influence of certain noneconomic forces is eliminated. The persons compared are under the same government, are subject to the same laws, and enjoy the advantages of the same educational system. And secondly, as purchasers in a common market, contemporaneous workers tend to be equally benefited by improved methods of production. In comparing their respective condition, therefore, we eliminate the effect of economic development upon the laborer considered as a consumer and thereby emphasize its influence upon the laborer considered as a producer.

This method of investigation M. Rousiers has used, not for the discovery of new truth, but for the verification of conclusions

already reached deductively. A criticism of his positive theory, therefore, naturally divides itself into two parts: (1) An examination of the deductive theory; (2) a careful scrutiny of the facts by which he seeks to verify this theory.

#### OUTLINE OF M. ROUSIERS'S DEDUCTIVE THEORY.

Improved methods of production and transportation tend to enlarge the field of active competition. A modern industry supplies not a local but a world market; and is, therefore, sensitive, not only to changes in productive processes, but to fluctuations in the demands of foreign nations, to alterations in tariff laws, to civil and international complications. A war in America seriously cripples the textile industry of England. A tariff in Germany affects adversely agricultural interests in the United States. These disturbing influences are of course beyond the control of the industries affected by them. The laborer is safe only if not tied down to any one employment. Mobility is the great desideratum.

But that which makes production on a large scale possible, and which is therefore directly responsible for the instability of the modern industry has made the modern laborer mobile. For machinery has taken over all specialized work and has allowed the laborer to become despecialized. A long apprenticeship is no longer necessary in a highly developed modern industry. The inexperienced girl directs the machine and replaces the trained handworker of the past. The barrier between the skilled and the unskilled is broken down, and the laborer, bound to no one employer and to no one occupation, is more independent than ever before. A good general education and a knowledge of industrial conditions are more essential to his success than technical training, for he is no longer protected by a monopoly of skill.

Modern industrial conditions tend to develop in the laborer the same qualities that have already been developed in the entrepreneur. The workman is not a specialized tool but a man, and therefore, able to meet his employer on common ground.

The relation between capital and labor in the most highly developed industries—in those in which labor has become despecialized and unskilled—is the most satisfactory; and here we find trade-unionism at its best.

These, then, are the chief points in M. Rousiers's theory: (1) increasing instability of industrial conditions met; (2) by increased mobility of labor, due to its despecialization and to the destruction of the barrier between the skilled and the unskilled; (3) growth in the power and strength of trade-unionism in the unskilled, despecialized industries.

We have not the data necessary for a discussion of M. Rousiers's first conclusion—the increasing instability of industrial conditions, and can only enter against it the Scottish verdict of "not proven," for, while it is undoubtedly true, as M. Rousiers has pointed out, that, with an extension of its market, an industry comes within the range of an ever-increasing number of disturbing forces, its stability is determined, not by the number, but by the resultant of these forces. And to determine this resultant requires a careful counterbalancing of opposing influences that M. Rousiers has not even attempted. But whether the tendency is towards stability or instability, changes in industrial conditions will always be sufficiently frequent to make mobility an important factor in the well-being of the laboring class. The second point in M. Rousiers's theory is therefore worthy of careful consideration. Few will take issue with him on the proposition that the mobility of labor tends to increase. It is not the result, but the means by which he conceives this result to be reached, that is open to criticism. Is it true that the tendency of industrial development is to do away with the need for special skill and training, is to break down the barrier between skilled and unskilled, and in this way to bring about a complete mobility of labor?

Whenever machinery is introduced into any stage of a productive process, the cost of production in that stage is lowered, and there is a consequent fall in the price of the finished article.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>While in the case of any single commodity it is not true that a fall in cost is

This leads to an increase in the demand for it, followed by an increased demand for workers in all other stages of the same productive process. Since the machine tends to replace the human laborer in all operations that can be reduced to mere physical routine, but can never be employed where there is any requirement for the exercise of judgment and intelligence, there is a constant tendency in modern industry to increase the relative proportion of brain workers as compared with manual workers.

This is followed by a more minute subdivision of labor and a tendency to specialization in mental occupations. To borrow an illustration from Professor Marshall: Type-setting and many other routine processes connected with the publishing of a newspaper are now done by machinery. Economy in production is followed by a fall in price and a rise in demand. But more newspapers means employment for a larger number of reporters, editors, reviewers, and business managers. It becomes worth while for the reporter to make himself an adept in one line of work, for the reviewer to confine his attention to one department of literature. The machine can never do what some writer has designated "automatic brain work," bookkeeping, shorthand, etc., but it has, as we have seen, increased the demand for such work. This work is especially adapted to women, whose industrial career is, as a rule, too short to make it possible for them to fit themselves for any of the higher positions, and who lack the physical strength requisite for the ordinary manual occupations. Women's labor is, as a rule, subsidized labor. For woman generally, being part of an economic group, need not be entirely self-supporting, and is, therefore, willing to accept wages not only below the limit of family subsistence, but even below the limit of individual subsistence. Men are therefore forced to abandon occupations which women enter in large numbers.

necessarily followed by a corresponding rise in demand, it is true over the whole field of industry, for demand and supply are correlative forces. Therefore in attempting to determine the effect of machinery it is necessary to select as a typical industry, one in which a fall in cost is followed by a corresponding rise in demand.

Machinery takes over the routine physical work, and increases the demand for routine mental work. This demand tends to be satisfied by women, and men are thus forced out of two fields of employment, and are compelled to fit themselves to meet the demand for the higher grades of work—for work requiring the exercise of distinctly human qualities. While we often find a child or untrained woman feeding some complicated machine, such a state of things can be only temporary; for the work has been already reduced to mere routine, and must ultimately be taken over by a self-feeding automatic piece of mechanism. The man in charge of a machine is often today, and will tend more and more to become, a skilled and responsible mechanic. Such a man can turn, with comparatively little difficulty, from the management of one machine to that of another in some allied industry. But his versatility is due to his special training, and to his knowledge of the principles underlying the workings of many machines. Economic development tends to increase the mobility of labor, because it requires a higher degree of training and ability; and the laborer who meets this demand is more adaptable because he is more intelligent.

In connection with machinery, there sometimes remains work to be done by the laborer, which, because it requires some degree of judgment, cannot be reduced to mere routine. This work may or may not demand a great degree of skill, but it does require quickness and accuracy, for the human worker must keep up with a pace set by an indefatigable iron worker, and a mistake means a loss in the time of both. While, therefore, in trades where machinery has not been introduced, it is often worth while to employ persons of varying degrees of efficiency, and to pay each one in proportion to the work actually accomplished, in industries where machinery is used there is no place for anyone who does not come up to the required standard. And so in the textile trades it is rare to find a spinner who is over forty years of age; after that period he must seek less exacting employment.

A third result of the introduction of machinery, therefore, is to do away with all gradations, and to separate into two sharply divided classes, the efficient and the inefficient, the competent and the incompetent.

The question now is as to the facts in which M. Rousiers hopes to find a verification of his deductive theory. His method, as we have before said, is to arrange in order of development, and compare with one another, existing types of successive stages of economic progress. For the present purpose we shall confine our attention to the industries selected as representatives of the last two stages of development, as shown by the conditions of labor among the cotton operatives of Lancashire and the dockers of London.

The textile industries offer the most complete example of the triumph of machinery which can at present be found in any trade. The workman occupies but a secondary position, and serves the machine instead of being served by it. Apprenticeship disappears with the need for technical skill. Women are no longer handicapped by their inferior physical strength nor by the temporary nature of their presence in the factory.<sup>1</sup>

In these industries where, according to M. Rousiers, skill gives no monopoly, trade unionism is at its best. Employers and employed are organized. The operatives have learned to select for their secretary a practical, reasonable man, conversant with all trade details. When disputes arise, this secretary meets the secretary of the employers' association, and, according to the testimony offered before the Royal Commission on Labor, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred a satisfactory settlement is reached. In case of failure to agree, the matter in dispute is laid before a joint committee of employers and employed, and no strike is authorized by either organization until the efforts of this committee to reach an amicable settlement have proved futile. A uniform wage scale prevails throughout the whole district for the spinners and weavers. In case of a general strike there is no attempt on the part of employers to introduce labor from without. But there is a complete cessation of work

<sup>1</sup> P. 287.

until one side or the other yields, or until, as more frequently happens, a compromise is effected.

In the terms of agreement by which the strike of March 1893 was brought to a close, clause iv reads as follows :

"Any question affecting the general interests of the cotton industry to be considered by a joint committee of employers and men." This last clause marks the assumption of an entirely new rôle by organizations of labour. It admits the operatives to a share in the government of the industry, and thus when the furthest stage of contemporary evolution is reached we find the workers beginning to recover something of the control which they would seem to have lost forever with the advent of the factory.<sup>1</sup>

For the strength of trade-unionism in these industries, M. Rousiers finds an explanation in the fact that both employers and workmen have come to recognize that it is to their mutual advantage that each should be completely organized, and that the operatives have learned to select as their representatives experienced, reasonable men, with whom employers find it more satisfactory to deal than with unorganized individuals. This is the only explanation open to M. Rousiers, who considers that the textile worker requires no special training and is therefore protected from outside competition by no barrier of skill. But is this explanation adequate? Only on the supposition that there is a complete unity of interest between employers and employed; only on the supposition that it is to the advantage of each that the other should be strong.

Disagreements to be settled between employers and their workmen divide themselves into two classes. (1) Local disputes due to the petty tyranny or negligence of some employer, to the unreasonableness of some group of workmen, or to mutual misunderstanding. (2) Disputes on general questions affecting the whole industry—*e. g.*, as to the rate of wages or the hours of labor. Disputes of the first class can be settled in a far more satisfactory manner if both the employers and the laborers concerned are members of powerful organizations: first, because the original disputants are not the parties called upon to settle

<sup>1</sup> P. 338.

the difficulty, and therefore the element of personal bitterness tends to be eliminated; secondly, because paid officials of the two associations can meet on more nearly equal terms, since there is less difference between them in social position; and thirdly, because powerful organizations know too well the cost of a strike to enter upon one for a trivial, local cause. Employers and operatives summoned before the Commission on Labor were unanimous in testifying to the comparative ease with which local disputes were settled in industries where both sides were completely organized. But when the question at issue is some general one, concerning, for example, the rate of wages to be paid, there is no longer a necessary unity of interest. And it is by no means apparent that it is to the advantage of employers that in the settlement of such questions they should deal with powerful and wealthy unions rather than with their men individually. The constant success of the Spinning Operatives' Association in extorting higher rates of wages cannot be accounted for on the supposition that the union exists only on sufferance, only because the employers find it to their interest to deal with an organized body.

The cotton manufacturers summoned before the Royal Commission testified<sup>1</sup> that the success of the unions in raising the rate of wages had reduced profits to a minimum, and that private capital was leaving the trade. That there was truth in these statements is shown by the fact that the union officials expressed themselves as entirely satisfied with the share of the output that

<sup>1</sup> See testimony of Mr. Noble, member of Cotton Manufacturers Association, C, I, Question 4016; also testimony of Mr. Russell, cotton manufacturer, *ibid.*, 3429-3645, 3452—I say with good trade wages would naturally rise, with bad trade they would naturally fall. But I do say, that the union snatch, as in this last instance, wages which the trade can not afford to pay.

Mr. Noble, *ibid.*, 4180—Do I understand your position to be that, in your opinion, substantial men, large private capitalists are withdrawing from the trade, and that their places are being taken by joint stock and speculative companies? Ans. Yes. 4154—I understand you take some exception to the action of the unions in pressing the employers a little too hard in the matter of wages. Ans. Yes, that is true. 4155—But as regards trade disputes of a purely local character, I understand you to say that the actions of the unions has generally been reasonable and satisfactory?

labor was securing, and rather plumed themselves in being better than their employers in striking a bargain.

If the cotton operatives have no monopoly of skill, it is difficult to understand why the employers are leaving the trade instead of bringing in outside labor, especially when one considers the low rates being paid in the agricultural districts. And so we are brought to the question : Is M. Rousiers right in his assertion that the textile operative is unskilled and despecialized. The only proof offered is the fact that in the cotton industry formal apprenticeship no longer exists and that girls of nineteen and twenty are employed as weavers not as spinners. Now, while it is true that apprenticeship has been abolished, yet years of training are required. The child enters the mill as a half-timer at ten years of age and does not become a finished spinner until he is twenty-one. The girl of eighteen is employed at the looms, but she is by no means unskilled, for she has served a virtual apprenticeship of eight years. So great is the dexterity required that the testimony of experts was to the effect that training must begin in childhood, and some even went so far as to say that the efficiency of the future worker would be impaired if the age of entering the factory as a half-timer were raised to thirteen. It thus appears that M. Rousiers's theory is not verified by the facts in the cotton industry. For while in it machinery has been extensively introduced and trade-unionism is at its best, the need for special training still exists, and the Operatives' Associations are strong, not because the barrier between the skilled and the unskilled has been broken down, but because it still stands to protect them.

Since M. Rousiers considers the introduction of machinery to be the moving force in economic evolution, it was to be

Ans. Yes; wherever they have come in conference with the employers, I think something like a reasonable settlement has been arrived at.

Testimony of Mr. Mawdsley, secretary of the Amalgamated Association of Operative Cotton Spinners, C, I, 732 : We are satisfied of this, that if there is to be any injury to the trade in the future it will have to come out of our pockets and not out of the pockets of the employers. We believe that we have screwed them up as far as we can.

expected that he would select, as typical of the latest stage of development, an occupation in which machinery played even a more significant rôle than in the textile industries. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to find that he has selected employment at the docks, where machinery has not yet been introduced to any considerable extent and where the typical laborer is an ordinary porter. The only justification for this choice is given in the following extract :

They [the dockers] are almost completely despecialized, and their employment is very precarious. They are not dependent either on special skill of their own or on an employer. The labor question, therefore, so far as it concerns them presents itself under quite modern conditions, similar to those towards which the general organization of labor is tending. Thus they are proper subjects of inquiry at the conclusion of our examination of the labor question.<sup>1</sup>

From this quotation we are forced to conclude that the docker has been selected as the type of the modern workman, not because he is engaged in an industry more highly evolved than the textile, but because he is both despecialized and unskilled and therefore satisfies the requirements of M. Rousiers's theory. The method adopted required that the industries compared should be arranged in order of development. This order was reversed when a belated industry was placed after one that was highly developed, when the docks were placed after the textile factories; and therefore the conclusions reached are worthless as a means of verifying a theory of economic development.

A study of the docks, however, may serve to confirm or to refute M. Rousiers's conclusion as to the strength of trade-unionism among the unskilled—a conclusion not organically connected with his theory of industrial progress. Like many other economists, M. Rousiers has taken the dock strike of 1889 as a fair measure of the strength of the "New Unionism." To do so, however, is to overlook the fact that the victory then won was due to a peculiar conjunction of circumstances that may

<sup>1</sup> P. 342.

never take place again, and that certainly is not present in the ordinary labor dispute.

To appreciate the truth of this statement it is necessary to consider in some details the causes that led to the strike. For some years conditions of employment at the docks had been unsatisfactory. Trade fluctuated with the seasons, and the work was necessarily irregular. The chance of getting a few hours employment attracted all classes of the unemployed; and the dock officials, having a constant supply of labor at their gates, adopted the policy, immediately economical, but ultimately costly, of employing the men from hour to hour. A laborer taken on in the morning could only be certain of an hour's employment, and if dismissed was unlikely to find work elsewhere for the remainder of the day. As a result, the better class of laborers avoided the docks, while the idle and dissolute were attracted there. The demand for casual labor tended, as it always does, to augment the supply; while irregular earning led to the further degradation of an already degraded class. The strike was an organized effort to ameliorate the condition of the docker, and to make his employment less irregular—it was an attack upon a shortsighted policy, costly alike to employers and employed. The docks-managers had not anticipated trouble with their men, and had made no efforts to secure non-union labor. The stevedores, a class of skilled workmen struck in sympathy, and it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to fill their places.<sup>1</sup>

The public supported the strikers, and the great charitable institutions, holding the docks management responsible for much of the misery and demoralization of East London, con-

<sup>1</sup> On page 356 M. Rousiers writes: "Thanks to the stevedores the dockers' strike led to results which benefited the whole trade. Without the support of the Stevedores' Union the strike would unquestionably have failed." On the next page, however, we find that the victory is attributed to the Dockers' Union, and is taken as a measure of what an organization of unskilled workmen can accomplish. "Thus the Dockers' Union, though organized in the midst of a crisis, and therefore under very unfavorable conditions, succeeded in obtaining a valuable reform, and this by its own efforts, and without the intervention of any public authority."

tributed liberally to the maintenance of the men and their families. The Salvation Army alone fed several thousand every day. Without this substantial assistance starvation would have forced the dockers to surrender. But the active interference of the public in labor disputes is not usual, and can only be counted upon when the right is clearly on one side.

And last, and perhaps most important, to quote from Mr. Hubbard, chairman of the joint committee of the London, St. Katherine and East India Docks Company :

It is more difficult to employ free labor in the docks of London than in any other industry in the world, because they extend over such an enormous area, and are absolutely open to the public. . . . It would be absolutely impossible for the police to give individual protection to every one of those six thousand men.

The dockers' victory, then, must be attributed to the unprotected position of the London port, to the sympathetic strike of a class of skilled workmen, and to the active support of the public, and not to the economic strength of a union of unskilled workmen. As a result of the strike, the remuneration of the ordinary docker was raised from five to six pence per hour, and overtime was paid at a higher rate. Any laborer taken on in the morning was guaranteed at least four hours work. These were the important provisions in the Mansion House agreement. In addition to this the London and India Docks Company agreed that in piece work the union might appoint a representative to be second in command in the gang and to be present at the taking on of new men.<sup>1</sup> For some time after the strike non-union men found it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain employment at the docks, and even foremen were forced to join the mens' association. But this condition of affairs did not last. All the concessions that served to strengthen the union as a union, have been lost. The right to appoint representatives has been taken away, and foremen have been forbidden to become members of the mens' association, while the London and India Docks Company holds itself free to employ either union or non-union labor.

<sup>1</sup>*Minutes of Evidence*, B, I, 4607.

The terms of the Mansion House agreement, it is true, have been adhered to, but this cannot be taken as an indication of the strength of the union, for the docks managers have come to recognize that it is to their own interest to diminish as much as possible the number of casuals employed, and by paying a higher wage to attract to the docks a steadier and more competent class of workmen.<sup>1</sup>

The history of the Hull strike of 1893 is in strong contrast with that of the London strike of 1889, and forcibly reveals the inherent weakness of a union of unskilled workmen when left to fight its own battles unaided. Hull was the best organized port in the kingdom prior to the strike. The laborers employed were all members of one or other of the great unions and even the shipping clerks and foremen had been forced to join the mens' associations. When disputes arose Mr. Wilson, the employer, met and conferred with the union officials. The Dockers' Union, overestimating its power, constantly demanded new concessions. Finally, on the employment of a few non-unionists, a strike was ordered. After being out several weeks,

<sup>1</sup>According to the docks managers, the increased cost of labor since the strike has been borne by the public and not by the Docks companies. Mr. Hubbard, B, I, 4856: The public was extremely anxious that the docks laborers' wages should be increased after the strike, and the wages were so increased. Consequently the rates for the performance of the work had to be increased to the public. They have been increased about to an extent to remunerate us for the increase. We could not get the full advantage of that in the first instance.

See also testimony of Colonel Birt, Manager of the Millwall Dock, B, I, 7110-7112: The loss of trade due to the strike was temporary except in regard to transcontinental trade. The loss was simply hastened in that class of business. 6906.—Will you explain why the demand for casual labour is less than it was? Col. Birt—The casual labourer in olden times was a man of very inferior physique; the casual labourers consisted largely of old men who were worked out, or young fellows who never had much strength. Their labour, of course, was not of any great value, but the rate of pay of 5d. per hour was not sufficient to attract a better class of men. The 6d per hour has brought that class of men in, and there is a very great improvement in the casual labourers now. 6907.—As I understand it, it comes to this: that the employers have found it answers better to pay rather higher wages for a superior class of men? Ans.—The payment was rather forced upon us. 6908.—But whether forced upon you or not, that is what was done? Ans.—One result is clearly that we get a better class of men.

the men were obliged to abandon their position. Many outside laborers had been brought in during the strike, and a number of the union men found themselves without employment. The rest came back as individuals, and not as members of the union, and were forced to bind themselves not to strike for at least six months. This crushing defeat is thus described by M. Rousiers :

From a general point of view, the result of the Hull strike strengthened the hands of the Dockers' Union. The men emerged from the struggle with an organization which had stood the test, and with leaders who had shown themselves worthy of the confidence of their fellows and the respect of their opponents. In addition to this they had learned a lesson. The failure of the Hull docker to shut the labor market against non-union men by means of strict regulations showed that future solutions would not lie in that direction.<sup>1</sup> It therefore remains to organize unions in such a way as to make it to the employers' interest to deal with them :<sup>2</sup>

The limits of the present paper do not permit a study of other labor unions among the unskilled, but it is worthy of note that the Royal Commission on Labor, after a careful considera-

<sup>1</sup> Unions of unskilled workmen sometimes obtain important concessions from the desire of employers to avoid the cost and confusion incident to a strike. But since, except under peculiar circumstances, such unions can be defeated by the introduction of outside labor, no concession will be granted if its capitalized cost to employers is greater than the cost of securing a victory. And in determining whether it is worth while to provoke a strike, employers will take into account not only the cost of the concession actually demanded, but the cost of concessions that will probably be asked for in the future if the one in question be granted. Moreover, it is not necessary in order to defeat such a union that employers should obtain a full quota of new men. For if a considerable number of former workmen become convinced that the union is powerless to secure their re-employment, they will desert and apply for work as individuals. Thus the aggressive power of unions of unskilled laborers is strictly limited. They might, however, serve a useful purpose in co-operating with similar associations of employers in the settlement of local disputes. The recent history of such unions, however, shows that they are not satisfied to confine their activity within such narrow limits, and that they often select as representatives men who are more ready to provoke a contest than to arrange a compromise. But in several cases, where as the result of a strike the power of a union has been broken, employers have themselves attempted to establish the machinery necessary for the settlement of minor disputes, and thus to retain the advantages, while getting rid of the disadvantages, of a union among their workmen (see *Minutes of Evidence*, B, I-II-III).

<sup>2</sup> P. 356.

tion of all accessible facts, reached the following conclusion, diametrically opposed to that of M. Rousiers:

Upon the whole, it is not yet shown by experience that it is easy, if indeed it is practicable, to mold into a permanent organization men working at an occupation which is not of the nature of a craft requiring special training. Such an organization, not being built upon the foundation of a natural monopoly of skill, is apt to fall away and perish in times of trade depression or other adverse circumstances.<sup>1</sup>

KATHARINE FELTON.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

<sup>1</sup> *Final Report*, p. 30, sec. 77.